

2

THE ELUSIVE DIALECT BORDER

*Dick Smakman and Marten van der Meulen***Introduction**

The outlines of national languages are relatively uncontested, as they often coincide with generally agreed-upon political borders. However, drawing boundaries between language varieties that are not national languages is often more challenging. For example, language varieties do not always stop at political borders, such as is the case for Spanish in South America and for Russian in Europe. Smaller varieties also cross national borders, as is the case for the dialects that are part of the South Slavic dialect continuum, which runs through Bosnia, Serbia, and Croatia. Moreover, such dialect continua may be interrupted in unexpected ways. For instance, speakers of the language varieties Rakhaing, Intha, and Tavoyan, which are classified as dialects of Burman, all view their own dialects as being separate and non-Burman. Yet another issue is the views of speakers themselves. As an illustration, speakers of Palaung varieties, as spoken in Burma, China, and Thailand, often claim that they speak one and the same language, yet they are not usually mutually intelligible (Müller & Weymouth, 2016). All of these factors present challenges for those wishing to draw boundaries between language varieties.

The most obvious and common criterion to separate one language variety from another is linguistic. This is how traditional dialectology has operated since the 19th century, as exemplified by the establishment of geographical boundaries for the Linguistic Atlas of France (Guilliéron & Edmont, 1902–1910). While drawing dialect boundaries has always been challenging, in today's highly mobile and linguistically versatile world new challenges have presented themselves.

Chapter overview

This chapter discusses the dividing lines between dialects. It firstly describes what we generally know about dialects. The distinction between 'dialect' and 'language' is explored, as is the geographical and social distribution of dialects and the differences

between rural and urban dialects. After that, ten ways to delineate dialects are discussed, particularly the distinction between linguistic and perceived boundaries.

Dialect

Definition

Various definitions of dialect exist. The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (CoE, 1992) referred to 'regional or minority languages' as languages that 'are traditionally used within a given territory of a State by nationals of that State who form a group numerically smaller than the rest of the State's population; and [which are] different from the official language(s) of that State' (1–2). This agrees with the general definition of dialect. For Ethnologue (Lewis, Simons, & Fennig, 2014), dialects are the result of the interplay between linguistic characteristics, shared history, and ethnic identity. Dictionary definitions often refer to geographical and linguistic features (deviation from the language norm) to define and distinguish dialects, as is the case for Italian (Gabrielli, 2015) and, for instance, Albanian (Cipo, Çabej, Domi, Krajni, & Myderrizi, 2005).

Whether a language variety should be referred to as 'language' or 'dialect' is not always straightforward. For example, while Abruzzese is often considered to be a dialect of Italian, from a historical perspective it stems from a different branch of the Romance family, making it a sister language of Italian rather than a dialect. Cantonese is another language variety that is officially a dialect, but its codification as well as its broad usage and functions would make it seem to be a language.

The definition of 'dialect' adhered to in this chapter is that a dialect is a language variety that is in some way distinct from the standard language and that has developed relatively freely from prescriptive codification. This definition is in accordance with definitions found in dictionaries. Examples of such varieties are the dialect of Hokkaido (Northern Japan), the Geordie dialect (North East England), and dialects such as Appalachian, Minnesotan, or Texan English (United States of America). Although laymen generally associate dialects with rural areas, urban dialects, such as the Cologne dialect (Germany) and the Beijing dialect (China), are also considered parts of the dialect landscape.

Linguistic characteristics

Dialects constitute fully fledged linguistic systems. The reason to use the word 'dialect' rather than 'language' is to distinguish it from the codified language norm (which might be called the 'standard', 'official' or 'national' language). Unlike the language norm, dialects are less likely to receive official acceptance and support. Also, they are less likely to be codified and used in formal and official settings. This indirectly affects the actual linguistic features of dialects. For example, the intonation patterns of dialects and norm languages may be different, because these two varieties are associated with different registers and different communicative

contexts. Also, the norm language often has a larger lexicon, because it covers a broader range of functions and registers. Dialects are more often used in less formal situations (i.e., at home or between friends), and they are associated mostly with spoken communication, which means that they are not usually constrained in their development and usage by a written norm.

Another linguistic observation is that the linguistic distance between different types of dialects and the broader language norm can differ: in general, urban dialects tend to be closer to a broader language norm than rural dialects are. For example, the distinctive Beijing dialect is close to Standard Mandarin Chinese (Xu, 1992). Similarly, the urban dialect of Tokyo is linguistically close to Standard Japanese (Inoue, 1991). Finally, the Palestinian city dialects are known to resemble the city dialects of nearby Lebanon and Western Syria without being direct neighbours (Al-Wer, 2002). This linguistic sameness among urban dialects and their closeness to the language norm are due to trade and political relations and to communication among cities.

Determining dialect borders

Border types

Borders between dialects can be drawn on the basis of several criteria. These criteria often overlap and none of them is ever the only factor in establishing dividing lines. Nevertheless, an effort is made here to discuss them separately. The most obvious border is a linguistic one. Besides linguistic borders, there are perceptual borders that exist in the minds of lay speakers, including the speakers of the dialects themselves. Furthermore, there is a range of borders that can be drawn based on factors that also may have played a role in the emergence of these borders. Factors we discuss in this sense are geography, politics, and religion. Finally, there are dialect borders that depend on factors emerging in changing societies and are related to communication and identity. These are ethnic borders, identity borders, social connotations borders, and communication-based borders.

1. Linguistic borders

Dialects are most often distinguished on the basis of linguistic characteristics. Dialect speakers have linguistic traits in common and these can be used to identify them as a group and to distinguish them from other groups. As Chambers and Trudgill (1998) stated, the traditional method of linguistically separating language varieties is by drawing isoglosses, lines 'marking the boundaries between two regions which differ with respect to some linguistic feature' (89). These linguistic features are mostly lexical and phonetic. Usually, dialects are separated by bundles of such isoglosses, where a number of isoglosses fall more or less together. In the 19th century, research was done in several European countries to establish dialect boundaries by closely investigating the ways local speakers pronounced words or made lexical

choices. The best known example is the research that was done in France (Guil­liéron & Edmont, 1902–1910), which established French dialect borders. From this and similar research arose the boundary in France between the dialects of the north (*langue d'oc*) and those of the south (*langue d'oïl*) (Jochnowitz, 1973).

Modern-day efforts are being made to calculate the linguistic distance between dialects by Chiswick and Miller (2005), among others, who applied so-called Levenshtein distances to linguistics. This measure calculates the distance between two items based on the minimum number of single-character edits (insertions, deletions, or substitutions) that are required to change one item (lexical or phonemic, for instance) into the other. This method was used by, among others, Valls et al. (2012) for Catalan dialects, by Osenova, Heeringa, and Nerbonne (2009) for Bulgarian dialects, and by Heeringa, Johnson, and Gooskens (2009) for Norwegian dialects.

Nevertheless, no uniform approach exists for quantifying the linguistic distance between dialects. Lexical relatedness, and particularly the sharing of cognates, is an important predictor of linguistic distance, and it deserves more attention in determining linguistic distance and boundaries; the more cognate words dialects share, the lower the linguistic distance. Dividing lines are even thinner if these etymologically related words mean the same or similar things. German *sterben* ('to die') and English 'to starve' share an etymological source but do not mean the same thing, while German *sterben* and (neighbouring) Dutch *sterven* mean the same thing. Cognates may even have opposite meanings, like Polish *biały* ('white') and English *black*. So, besides the percentage of cognates, the percentage of semantically similar or identical cognates should be counted. Besides cognates, other aspects that are often measured are similarities of syntax and written forms.

Increased linguistic, methodological, and historical awareness may lead to the reconsideration of firmly established dialect borders, and it could in fact lead to the acknowledgement of new dialects or languages. A recent example is Kashubian, as spoken in the Pomorze region in North West Poland. Long considered a dialect of Polish, it is now increasingly treated as a separate language on linguistic grounds (Szul, 2015). This language contains a number of features that do not exist in Polish dialects, such as nine distinct vowels (standard Polish has only five), and some of its subdialects have phonemic word stress, unlike Polish. This recent acceptance is partly of a political nature, but it could not have taken place without developments in the field of linguistics.

2. Perceived borders

Researchers may try to employ objective criteria to draw lines between dialects, but dialect speakers may (partly) disagree with these borders, based on their perception of and attitudes towards dialects and their boundaries. Such views are relevant because they have been shown to be a factor in the maintenance or shaping of dialect borders (Britain, 2014). Several methods have so far been tried out to measure perceived language borders.

The Dutch dialectologist Weijnen (1946, 1947) developed the so-called *pijltjes-methode* ('Arrows Method'). After asking informants to name places in their own region where people spoke either the same or differently, Weijnen drew arrows between places that were marked as similar, while drawing borders between places that were never marked as such. In this way, perceived micro-dialectal areas could be identified. Weijnen's method received criticism on several points. For instance, he failed to demarcate what he meant by one's 'own' region/surroundings, i.e., the point of view of participants. Furthermore, he only focussed on similarities and did not deal with contradictory results (Goeman, 1989; Preston, 1999), although these are equally relevant. Perhaps because of the criticism, but also probably because of the complications regarding aggregating results, the Arrows Method remains little used.

In Japan, the so-called Degree-of-Difference method (Grootaers, 2000 [1959]; Mase, 1964 [1999]) was developed. Informants were asked to grade the similarity of the language in surrounding areas on a scale from one to four. Based on these results, dialect areas could be defined. A third method uses the map-drawing technique by Preston (1982), who built on practices developed in perceptual geography. Preston asked informants to draw dialect areas on maps and give (linguistic) characteristics of speakers in the drawn areas. By aggregating results of individual participants, estimates could be made as to where perceptual dialect boundaries lay. The map-drawing task has received quite a following, like Pearce (2011) and Montgomery (2012), especially since computational methods for calculating and plotting aggregates have become easier. It has now been used in a variety of other countries, including Turkey (Demirci & Kleiner, 1999), Germany (Dailey-O'Cain, 1999), Canada (McKinnie & Dailey-O'Cain, 2002), and New Zealand (Nielsen & Hay, 2006). A general problem with perceived borders is that they may be strongly influenced by political or geographical boundaries, and, more importantly, may vary widely between speakers. However, this may be solved by the increasingly robust statistical methods that are used to aggregate perceptions.

In most cases, perceptual borders in these investigations agreed with traditional borders, but in some cases, dialect borders that dialectologists considered to exist were not distinguished by participants or were located differently. In such cases, researchers have tried to combine linguistic and perceptual results. Daan and Blok (1969) did this for Dutch and Benson (2003) worked on data for Ohio in the United States.

3. Geographical borders

Natural landmarks, such as mountain ranges, rivers, or impenetrable forests, can hinder communication or even prevent it, resulting in linguistic differences and ultimately different dialects. The Fens, an area in East England, are an example of a region where this happened. Here, the marshes between towns and villages were a natural obstacle, both real and perceived, that hindered travel. This geographical characteristic created a sense of distance and this negatively affected the intensity of communication (Britain, 2014; Britain & Trudgill, 2005), and, as a result, it affected dialect formation and dialect boundaries. Research by Calabrese et al. (2011) in the United

States of America showed that even perceptions of natural boundaries (especially distance) affect communication, which was in line with the findings on the Fens area.

It may even be that geographical features that are no longer relevant are still an indication of historically evolved boundaries. Britain (2014) demonstrated how, despite the disappearance of certain obstacles in the landscape in the English Fens (the marshes were largely drained in the 17th century), the effects of old geographically motivated dialect boundaries remain relatively persistent today. Conversely, geographical features do not always affect dialect formation. As Beswick (2014) explained, landscape obstacles may be of limited importance if cross-border communication is still lively. Beswick took the Minho River as an example, which separates Portugal and Galicia, but which has had little dialectological impact.

4. *Political borders*

Political and local government borders affect mobility and can thus shape dialect areas. The existence of political borders may induce people to adjust their language and may affect dialect formation. In the Kleverland dialect continuum, the Dutch and German dialects diverged under the influence of the state border (Giesbers, 2008) between the Netherlands and Germany. Other examples are the differences in pronunciation in the two parts of the Dutch language area (the Netherlands and northern Belgium), which are increasing although the political dividing line is weak (Van de Velde, 1996). At the Scottish/English border, too, the national border affects dialect use on either side (Watt, Llamas, Docherty, Hall, & Nycz, 2014).

The natural, language contact-induced shaping of dialects may in fact be overruled by politics. Some dialects are even separated from neighbouring ones through political or ideological lines. For example, Chinese children are generally taught that Cantonese is a dialect of Chinese, which is not true from a linguistic or socio-linguistic point of view.

5. *Economic borders*

Economic motivations are an important impetus for linguistic contact. The ensuing language contact is known to create linguistic similarities and have a levelling effect. Comparing results of a late 19th century German dialect survey with current data, Falck, Heblich, Lameli, and Südekum (2010) combined economic, linguistic, cultural, and historical information to discover whether 21st century economic exchanges are still affected by cultural borders laid in the past. Their research confirmed that many such borders are indeed time-persistent and continue to determine modern-day economic exchange, thereby still affecting dialects.

6. *Religious borders*

The distribution of religion may divide or connect speakers of dialects, as people often have more contact with likeminded people. Fox (2010), Baker and Bowie (2009), Hamburger (2005), and Di Paolo (1993) investigated religion as a means

of identifying groups of speakers and all concluded that religion can impact one's speech and, as a result, dialect borders.

Religion may in fact lead to a reshuffling of language and dialect borders. For instance, after the fall of Yugoslavia in the 1990s, the population in Croatia spoke three main dialects. The new Croatian government wanted their own distinctive language, as did the neighbouring new country of Serbia. In the existing dialect continuum, lines could not be drawn on the basis of linguistic differences, and instead, religious affiliation became the criterion. Most inhabitants of the Serbian part of the dialect were Orthodox and most of the dialect speakers on the Croatian side were Catholic. The difference between the two languages was emphasised by the promotion on the Catholic side of the Roman script and on the Orthodox side of the Cyrillic script, thus creating an even deeper schism within the area through orthography.

7. *Ethnic borders*

Ethnicity is strongly associated with borders between language varieties of all kinds. The South African situation is a good example of this. Ethnicity is an inherited quality that groups of people share and often identify with. It is a combination of shared cultural heritage, ancestry, history, religion, mythology and ritual, cuisine, dressing style, art, physical appearance, and, for instance, homeland. The more of these features people have in common, the stronger their shared ethnicity. This joint identification is rooted in a set of shared social, cultural, and ancestral experiences, an important one of which is language. If a shared language is seen as being the distinctive feature of an ethnic group, then this group has an ethnolinguistic identity. This means that other features of the group are less visible than language. The Gaels are an example of an ethnolinguistic group. This group is indigenous to northwestern Europe and is most strongly associated with a certain language, namely Gaelic, which comprises several branches that are not necessarily mutually intelligible, such as Irish, Manx, and Scottish Gaelic. Language is the only real way in which this group is distinct from their English-speaking neighbours.

While often associated with rural living, ethnic dialect formation also takes place in urban settings. Wardhaugh and Fuller (2014) emphasised that ethnic dialects in such settings are not the same as foreign accents of a majority language. Their speakers, as they pointed out, are native speakers of the majority language. Ethnic dialects act as in-group ways of speaking the majority language. An example of such an urban ethnolinguistic group are speakers of African American Vernacular English, which is often unambiguously referred to as African American English, because it is spoken primarily by Americans of African descent. Denham and Lobeck (2010) felt that this type of English should be defined as an ethnic rather than a regional dialect, although it is associated with certain neighbourhoods.

8. *Identity borders*

It should be clear that ethnicity and identity strongly interact. In societies based on migration, such as Australia and the United States, speakers from different ethnic

backgrounds are nowadays often in continuous and close contact with other ethnic groups. Ethnolinguistic identity then starts to function as a strong identity marker (Wolfram & Ward, 2006). The British sociologist Maher (2005) proposed the phenomenon of ‘metro-ethnicity’, defining it as ‘a hybridized “street” ethnicity deployed by a cross-section of people with ethnic or mainstream backgrounds who are oriented towards cultural hybridity, cultural/ethnic tolerance and a multicultural lifestyle in friendships, music, the arts, eating and dress’ (83). In this view, individuals play with ethnicities, both from their own background and those from others, for aesthetic effect, without being sentimental about ethnic markers such as language. This goes against the essentialist view of a fixed set of basic attributes belonging to individuals that determine their identity, with these speakers living in a certain place and sharing dialect features.

Cornips and De Rooij (2013) and Cornips, Jaspers, and De Rooij (2015) revealed the possible mechanisms of identity assertion in large cities. They demonstrated how ethnically mixed groups may highlight mutual differences in communication with other such groups by giving different meanings and connotations to existing language items. Certain connotations of words were associated with certain neighbourhoods in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Dyer (2001) also demonstrated identity mechanisms when she found that younger speakers in the English town of Corby seemingly consciously used a pronunciation characteristic that was not part of their village’s dialect, but rather a feature of their ancestors’ Scottish heritage. Watt et al. (2014), furthermore, showed how a national border can function as an identity border by referring to the break in the dialect continuum that occurs at the Scottish/English border, while on both sides non-standard English is the daily language of communication. Aitken (1992) even considered the bundle of isoglosses at this border to be excessively high. In view of separatist sentiments in Scotland, it can be assumed that the Scottish differentiation from England-based dialect styles is particularly active. As Boberg (2014) showed, the border between Canada and the United States has a similar identity function.

9. *Social connotations borders*

Traditionally, dialects have a strong association with certain speakers and a particular way of living. As Chambers and Trudgill (1998) stated: ‘In common usage, [. . .] dialect is a substandard, low-status, often rustic form of language, generally associated with the peasantry’ (3). Two images of dialects tend to emerge in lay circles. First, there is the dialect as a linguistic deviation from the norm, which is spoken by speakers of questionable repute and with little social success. The more romantic interpretation is that of a language variety full of character, as used in a certain region by kind and helpful people, who are typically farmers. This language represents local customs and folklore. Chambers and Trudgill (1998) famously describe the biases even early dialectologists had in selecting informants: the typical dialect speakers were Non-mobile, Older, Rural Males (NORMs), selected because of the stability of the linguistic influences that they have been exposed to during their

lives. With less mobility comes less adjustment to a broader norm. A low educational level is also associated with dialects. While in lay circles, dialects are associated with rural regions, cities also hold dialects. Speakers of these dialects are also associated with less mobility and a low educational level. Urban speakers might typically have a blue-collar profession, like factory worker.

Evaluation research – as described, for instance, by Fasold (1987) – in which dialect speakers were contrasted with speakers of the norm language and speakers of city dialects, has provided a more nuanced picture of the way dialect speakers are viewed. A study by Šimičić and Sujoldžić (2004) illustrates this well. This investigation focussed on the evaluation of characteristics of speakers of Standard Croatian and of Croatian dialects. They showed that a rural dialect speaker was evaluated very positively for social attractiveness but very low for status. Conversely, in the same study the speaker of Standard Croatian was evaluated as high in competence but low in social attractiveness. The study also showed that an urban dialect may be evaluated on the basis of its closeness to the standard, with stereotypical speakers of urban dialects that are closer to the norm being evaluated similarly to speakers of that norm language.

Modern-day situations are often at odds with the stereotypical images described above. As for rural dialects, it is common for educated speakers to speak (or choose to speak) a dialect. In the Dutch province of Limburg, for instance, this is very common. A local GP, who is university educated and who may or may not be originally from the area, will function as bilingual in his/her local practice and speak the dialect in many cases.

It is common for a city dialect to carry a certain prestige, even outside its own geographical area. Consequently, the prototypical urban dialect speaker is nowadays defined as a progressive and ambitious dialect speaker. Cairene Arabic is a prestigious city dialect in Egypt, for instance, and other dialects from the capitols of countries in this region have a similar type of status; for instance, the dialect from Casablanca in Morocco (Hachimi, 2007) and that of Tripoli in Libya (Bassiouney, 2015; Pereira, 2007). Ambitious people, including ambitious newcomers to the city, seem drawn to these urban dialects. Goeman (2000) put forward the urban equivalent of NORMs, the 'MYSFs' ('Mobile Younger Suburban Females'). This group will typically be likely to speak a more urban dialect or a dialect that is between that of the local city dialect and a broader language norm. This reinforces the mixed association of dialects with social ambition.

10. *Communication-based borders*

Before the twentieth century, language contact necessarily took place through face-to-face contact among individuals. With the steady growth of non-face-to-face contact, old geographical dividing lines are increasingly being challenged. Modern-day speakers spend growing amounts of time communicating from a distance, either talking on the phone or online or through texting (Barasa, 2015). In the post-modern age, digital communities are emerging, which are not restricted

by geographical boundaries but defined partially by digital interactions. This seriously challenges the concept of map-drawn dialect boundaries.

Research done at IBM Research, MIT Senseable City Lab, and AT&T Labs (Calabrese et al., 2011) revealed data on digital communication among people in the United States of America that put regional boundaries in a different perspective. The researchers used information on social connectedness through telephone and SMS interactions among inhabitants. The maps and other data arising from this investigation into anonymised and aggregated mobile phone data, which was not collected for any sociolinguistic purpose, proved highly insightful regarding the formation of new speech communities and the nature of the dividing lines between them.

On the basis of phone connectedness, some adjacent states became separated, while other states merged. The researchers found the age of communicators to be the determining factor; young people text more eagerly and intensively and they do so with their age counterparts rather than with other generations. SMS communications, in addition, turned out to cover shorter distances than phone calls and were thus less likely to affect connectedness beyond the state level. More, and smaller, communities emerged this way. Similar research was done in Great Britain, by Ratti et al. (2010), and communities emerging from phone contact there turned out to be more cohesive than communities existing on the basis of geographical and administrative boundaries. It should be noted that Ratti et al. (2010) looked at landline phone communication, which may have affected older rather than younger people.

Rural and urban dialects are developing differently, so the above investigations suggest. Contact among nearby cities is leading to mutual similarities between cities that traditional language contact cannot account for. This approach provides a means to delineate geographical areas on the basis of relationships between people. As it turned out, the named connectedness sometimes follows traditional demarcations such as state lines.

Conclusion

Traditionally, 'dialect' referred to a language that deviates from the norm language and is identifiable on a combination of linguistic grounds and associated with a specific (limited) geographical spread and a certain type of speaker. It is passed on naturally and subconsciously from generation to generation, often in a monolingual situation, and gradually changes intergenerationally under little outside pressure as part of a dialect continuum. While this type of dialect is still quite common, it has been superseded by new settings of dialect usage. Mostly, new situations arise because of a higher number of competing languages and the changed mobility of speakers. Urban dialects are increasingly considered to be part of the dialect landscape.

The number of languages that dialects compete with is growing. Multilingual and semi-speakers of various varieties, including dialects, are growing in number in areas that were originally reserved for dialects and perhaps one more language,

namely the norm language. This change is disrupting the general view of dialects, which was that they are default communication systems for monolinguals that were sometimes under pressure only from the language norm of the larger area.

Newer generations are nowadays often born and raised in a situation where they are exposed to a range of languages of which their dialect is just one. As a result, they do not automatically pick up only the dialect during their critical period. Instead, they acquire a dominant language (possibly the dialect) and are faced with a choice as to what to do with the other languages on offer. While dialects are still being passed on as a default communication tool, increasing numbers of dialect speakers nowadays have the choice to speak the dialect, reject it, speak it in a 'mild' form, or simply adopt some identifying features of the dialect. They can use the dialect for certain symbolic reasons besides communicative ones, and they may use the dialect of selected stylised features outside the original area of origin of the dialect.

The high degree of fluidity in the individual use of dialects nowadays by many multilingual speakers is a challenge to those wanting to draw dialect boundaries. Traditional dialect speakers, whose lives are in line with the above-named traditional stereotypes, are still high in number, and the geographical areas associated with dialects are often still largely in place, but the notion of a linguistically and geographically static dialect can now increasingly be called into question. All types of mobilities as well as individual choices and identity negotiation call for new ways to approach the outlines of these language varieties.

References

- Aitken, A. J. (1992). Scots. In T. McArthur (Ed.), *The Oxford companion to the English language* (pp. 893–899). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Al-Wer, E. (2002). Jordanian and Palestinian dialects in contact: Vowel raising in Amman. In A. Jones & E. Esch (Eds.), *Language change: The interplay of internal, external and extra-linguistic factors* (pp. 63–79). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baker, W., & Bowie, D. (2009). Religious affiliation as a correlate of linguistic behaviour. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 15(2), 1–10.
- Barasa, S. N. (2015). Ala! Kumbé? "Oh my! Is it so?" Multilingualism controversies in East Africa. In D. Smakman & P. Heinrich (Eds.), *Globalising sociolinguistics: Challenging and expanding theories* (pp. 39–53). London: Routledge.
- Bassiouny, R. (2015). *Language and identity in modern Egypt*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Benson, E. J. (2003). Folk linguistic perceptions and the mapping of dialect boundaries. *American Speech*, 78(3), 307–330.
- Beswick, J. (2014). Borders within borders: Contexts of language use and local identity configuration in Southern Galicia. In D. Watt & C. Llamas (Eds.), *Language, borders and identity* (pp. 105–117). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Boberg, C. (2014). Borders in North American English. In D. Watt & C. Llamas (Eds.), *Language, borders and identity* (pp. 44–54). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Britain, D. (2014). Where North meets South? Contact, divergence and the routinisation of the Fenland dialect boundary. In D. Watt & C. Llamas (Eds.), *Language, borders and identity* (pp. 27–43). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Britain, D., & Trudgill, P. (2005). New dialect formation and contact-induced reallocation: Three case studies from the English Fens. *International Journal of English Studies*, 5(1), 183–209.
- Calabrese, F., Dahlem, D., Gerber, A., Paul, D., Chen, X., Rowland, J., Rath, C., & Ratti, C. (2011). *The Connected States of America: Quantifying social radii of influence*. Paper presented at The Third IEEE International Conference on Social Computing (SocialCom 2011), Boston.
- Chambers, J. K., & Trudgill, P. (1998). *Dialectology* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chiswick, B. R., & Miller, P. W. (2005). Linguistic distance: A quantitative measure of the distance between English and other languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 26(1), 1–11.
- Cipo, K., Çabej, E., Domi, M., Krajni, A., & Myderrizi, O. (Eds.). (2005). *Fjalor i Gjuhës Shqipe [Dictionary of the Albanian Language]*. Tirana: Botime Çabej.
- CoE. (1992). *European charter for regional or minority languages*. European Treaty Series. 148. Retrieved July 20, 2016 from http://humanrights.maltepe.edu.tr/sites/default/files/files/europan_charter_for_regional_or_minority_languages-5XI1992.pdf.
- Cornips, L., & De Rooij, V. A. (2013). Selfing and othering through categories of race, place, and language among minority youths in Rotterdam, The Netherlands. In P. Siemund, I. Gogolin, M. E. Schulz, & J. Davydova (Eds.), *Multilingualism and language diversity in urban areas: Acquisition, identities, space, education* (pp. 129–164). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cornips, L., Jaspers, J., & De Rooij, V. A. (2015). The politics of labelling youth vernaculars in the Netherlands and Belgium. In J. Nortier & B. A. Svendsen (Eds.), *Language, youth and identity in the 21st century: Linguistic practices across urban spaces* (pp. 45–68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daan, J., & Blok, D. (1969). *Van Randstad tot landrand*. Paper presented at the Bijdragen en Mededelingen der Dialectcommissie van de KNAW XXXVI, Amsterdam.
- Dailey-O’Cain, J. (1999). The perception of post-unification German regional speech. In D. R. Preston (Ed.), *Handbook of perceptual dialectology* (Vol. 1, pp. 227–242). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Demirci, M., & Kleiner, B. (1999). The perception of Turkish dialects. In D. R. Preston (Ed.), *Handbook of perceptual dialectology* (Vol. 1, pp. 263–282). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Denham, K., & Lobeck, A. (2010). *Linguistics for everyone: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Boston: Wadsworth.
- Di Paolo, M. (1993). Propredicate do in the English of the Intermountain West. *American Speech*, 86, 339–356.
- Dyer, J. (2001). Changing dialects and identities in a Scottish-English community. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 7(3), 43–57.
- Falck, O., Heblich, S., Lameli, A., & Südekum, J. (2010). *Dialects, cultural identity, and economic exchange*. Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor.
- Fasold, R. W. (1987). *The sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fox, S. (2010). Ethnicity, religion, and practices: Adolescents in the east end of London. In C. Llamas & D. Watt (Eds.), *Language and identities* (pp. 144–156). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gabrielli, A. (Ed.). (2015). *Grande dizionario Hoepli italiano [Hoepli's great dictionary of Italian]*. Milan: Hoepli.
- Giesbers, C. (2008). *Dialecten op de grens van twee talen: Een dialectologisch en sociolinguïstisch onderzoek in het Kleverlands dialectgebied*. Utrecht: LOT.

- Goeman, T. (1989). Dialectes et jugements subjectifs des locuteurs. Quelques remarques de méthode a propos d'une controverse [Dialects and the subjective judgments of speakers: Remarks on controversial methods]. In D. Preston (Ed.), *Handbook of perceptual dialectology* (Vol. 1, pp. 135–144). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Goeman, T. (2000). Naast NORMs ook MYSFs in het veranderende dialectlandschap en het regiolect [Besides NORMs also MYSFs in the changing dialect landscape and the regiolect]. *Taal en Tongval*, 52(1), 87–100.
- Grootaers, W. A. (2000 [1959]). Origin and nature of the subjective boundaries of dialects. *The Japanese Journal of Language in Society*, 2(2), 58–77.
- Guilliéron, J., & Edmont, E. (1902–1910). *Atlas Linguistique de la France*. Paris: H. Champion.
- Hachimi, A. (2007). Becoming Casablanca: Fessis in Casablanca as a case study. In C. Miller (Ed.), *Arabic in the city: Issues in dialect contact and language variation* (Vol. 5, pp. 97–122). London: Routledge.
- Hamburger, L. (2005). The main motivating factors dictating language choices in three Jewish women. *Leeds Working papers in Linguistics and Phonetics*, 10.
- Heeringa, W., Johnson, K., & Gooskens, C. (2009). Measuring Norwegian dialect distances using acoustic features. In J.-L. Gauvain, M. G. J. Swerts, & K. Paliwal (Eds.), *Speech communication* (Vol. 51 (2), pp. 167–183). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Inoue, F. (1991). New dialect and standard language: Style shift in Tokyo. *Area and Culture Studies*, 42, 49–68.
- Jochnowitz, G. (1973). *Dialect boundaries and the question of Franco-Provençal*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Lewis, P., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2014). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world 17*. Retrieved November 24, 2015, from www.ethnologue.com
- Maher, J. C. (2005). Metroethnicity, language, and the principle of cool. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 2005(175/176), 83–102.
- Mase, Y. (1964 [1999]). Hôgen ishiki to hôgen kukaku [Dialect consciousness and dialect divisions]. In D. Preston (Ed.), *Handbook of perceptual dialectology* (Vol. 1, pp. 71–99). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- McKinnie, M., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2002). A perceptual dialectology of anglophone Canada from the perspective of young Albertans and Ontarians. In D. Long & D. R. Preston (Eds.), *Handbook of perceptual dialectology* (Vol. 2, pp. 277–294). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Montgomery, C. (2012). The effect of proximity in perceptual dialectology. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 16(5), 638–668.
- Müller, A., & Weymouth, R. (2016). *Constructing and deconstructing Kachin and Palaung linguistic identities*. Paper presented at the Language, Power and Identity in Asia. Creating and Crossing Language Boundaries, March 14–16, 2016.
- Nielsen, D., & Hay, J. (2006). Perceptions of regional dialects in New Zealand. *TēReo*, 48, 95–110.
- Osenova, P., Heeringa, W., & Nerbonne, J. (2009). A quantitative analysis of Bulgarian dialect pronunciation. *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, 66(2), 425–458.
- Pearce, M. (2011). Exploring a perceptual dialect boundary in North East England. *Dialectologia et Geolinguistica*, 19, 3–22.
- Pereira, C. (2007). Urbanization and dialect change: The Arabic dialect of Tripoli (Libya). In C. Miller & E. Al-Wer (Eds.), *Arabic in the city: Issues in dialect contact and language variation*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Preston, D. R. (1982). Perceptual dialectology: Mental maps of the United States dialects from a Hawaiian perspective. *Working Papers in Linguistics (University of Hawaii)*, 14, 5–49.

- Preston, D. R. (1999). *Perceptual dialectology*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Ratti, C., Sobolevsky, S., Calabrese, F., Andris, C., Reades, J., Martino, M., . . . Strogatz, S. H. (2010). Redrawing the map of Great Britain from a network of human interactions. *PLoS ONE*, 5(12), 1–6.
- Šimičić, L., & Sujoldžić, A. (2004). Cultural implications of attitude and evaluative reactions toward dialect variation in Croatian youth. *Collegium antropologicum*, 28(1), 97–107.
- Szul, R. (2015). Poland's language regime governing Kashubian and Silesian. In L. Cardina & S. K. Sonntag (Eds.), *State traditions and language regimes* (pp. 79–96). Montreal/Kingston/London/Ithaca: McGill–Queen's Press.
- Valls, E., Nerbonne, J., Prokic, J., Wieling, M., Clua, E., & Lloret, M.-R. (2012). Applying the Levenshtein distance to Catalan dialects: A brief comparison of two dialectometric approaches. *Verba: Anuario Galego de Filoloxia*, 39, 35–61.
- Van de Velde, H. (1996). *Variatie en Verandering in het Standaard-Nederlands (1935–1993) [Variation and change in Standard Dutch (1935–1993)]*. Utrecht: Landelijke Onderzoeksschool Taalwetenschap (LOT).
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2014). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (7th ed.). Malden/Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Watt, D., Llamas, C., Docherty, G., Hall, D., & Nycz, J. (2014). Language and identity on the Scottish/English border. In D. Watt & C. Llamas (Eds.), *Language, borders and identity* (pp. 8–27). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Weijnen, A. A. (1946). De grenzen tussen de oost-Noord-Brabantse dialecten onderling. In A. A. Weijnen, J. M. Renders, & J. Van Ginneken (Eds.), *Oost-Noordbrabantse dialectproblemen: Bijdragen en Mededelingen der Dialectencommissie van de Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Vol. 8, pp. 1–15). Amsterdam: KNAW.
- Weijnen, A. A. (1947). *De onderscheiding van dialectgroepen in Noord-Brabant en Limburg [The dividing lines between dialect groups in Noord Brabant and Limburg]*. Paper presented at the Akademiedagen, Amsterdam.
- Wolfram, W., & Ward, B. (Eds.). (2006). *American voices: How dialects differ from coast to coast*. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell.
- Xu, D. (1992). *A sociolinguistic study of Mandarin nasal variation*. (Ph.D.), University of Ottawa, Ottawa.